REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-16 are pending in this Application. Claims 1, 11 and 16 are independent claims. Claims 1-6 and 8-16 have been amended, and claim 7 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, by this Amendment.

The Office Action dated January 15, 2008 repeated and made final the prior art rejections of the claims. Specifically, claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 11-16 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by prior art, and dependent claims 3, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being rendered obvious by prior art.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Response to Arguments on pages 2-5 of the Office Action. After careful consideration of the Response to Arguments, this amendment amends each one of the independent claims to recite further features of the invention.

Independent Claim 1 is amended to additionally recite that the input signal "is filtered by said pre-equalizing function and the output signal of said pre-equalizing function is input to said signal processing circuitry." It is also amended to change "approximating a gradient of said difference..." to "calculating an approximation of the gradient of the expectation of the square of said difference..." Finally, independent claim 1 is amended to include the limitation from original dependent claim 7 (now cancelled) that "the transmission characteristic of said signal processing circuitry is approximated as a delay function." Independent claims 11 and 16 are also amended in a manner substantially similar to claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that the newly amended claims containing these features are allowable over the prior art, including the references applied in the previous prior art rejections of the claims. The previous prior art rejection relied upon the adaptive control processing and compensation estimator (ACPCE) 28 described at col. 22, lines 50-62, of U.S. Patent No. 6,313,703 issued to Wright et al. However, this element in the Wright et al patent has signal values filled in a memory to be held. In other words, they are delayed before further processing. See, for example, col. 22, lines 48-62. They are not "filtered by said pre-equalizing

Atty Docket No.: Nokia.1023US

function and the output signal of said pre-equalizing function is input to said signal processing

circuitry" as recited in the amended independent claims.

Furthermore, the amended independent claims are also allowable because of the feature

now included based on original dependent claim 7. This features requires that the transmission

characteristic is described as a delay function when being approximated. The Wright et al patent does not anticipate the amended independent claims even though the approximation therein may

does not anneipate the amended independent claims even though the approximation therein may

be based on a delay function. The previous obviousness rejection also asserted that the

secondary reference in the obviousness rejection, Daniel et al. "JOINT GRADIENT-BASED

TIME DELAY ESTIMATION AND ADAPTIVE FILTERING", suggested an adaptive filter

using gradient based time delay estimation, wherein the gradient, i.e. the function for updating

the adaptation coefficients, is in the form of a differential equation (page 3167, equations 24-26,

38-39). But this reference also does not suggest the subject matter now recited in the amended

independent claims.

Applicants believe that no fees are required for the consideration of this Amendment.

However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required for the consideration of this Amendment, or to otherwise avoid abandonment of this application, to

Deposit Account No. 10-0100 (NOKIA.1023US).

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: April 15, 2008

Robert Bauer, Reg. No. 34,487

Tel: (914) 723-4300 Fax: (914)723-4301

7